

DECLASSIFIED BY ORIGINATING AGENCY
MAY 2000
DISCLOSURE OF THIS APPLICATION AS FILED



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
112,945,300	09/29/82	GATE	20-18460

CUSHMAN, DARRY B CUSHMAN
1001 K ST., N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20004

EXAMINER	
JENNIFER C	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
221	4

DATE MAILED: 05/16/84

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 6 month(s), _____ day(s) from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. | 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948. |
| 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449 | 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-152 |
| 5. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474 | 6. <input type="checkbox"/> _____ |

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claim 1 is pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claim 1 is rejected.

5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☒ This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes until such time as allowable subject matter is indicated.

8. ☐ Allowable subject matter having been indicated, formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. These drawings are ☐ acceptable;
☐ not acceptable (see explanation).

10. ☐ The proposed drawing correction and/or the ☐ proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation). However, the Patent and Trademark Office no longer makes drawing changes. It is now applicant's responsibility to ensure that the drawings are corrected. Corrections MUST be effected in accordance with the instructions set forth on the attached letter "INFORMATION ON HOW TO EFFECT DRAWING CHANGES", PTO-1474.

12. ☒ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☒ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____, filed on _____.

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution to the next stage is allowed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1955 C.O. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ The NATIONAL SECURITY INFORMATION
Unauthorized disclosure subject
to Criminal Sanctions

EXAMINER'S ACTION

U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
MAY BE CONSIDERED DECLASSIFIED WHEN
CLASSIFICATION INDICATES THAT THE
DISCLOSURE OF THIS APPLICATION AS FILED

1. The drawings are objected to because in Figures 1 and 2 the numeral "1" denotes two different elements; and the rectangular boxes must be labeled in compliance with 37 CFR 1.83(a). Correction is required.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: In line 7 on page 2, in lines 6 and 8 on page 3, in line 13 on page 4, and in line 7 of claim 1, "round" should be --around--; in line 22 on page 2, a comma should be inserted at the end of the line; on pages 5 and 7-11 the numeral "1" refers to two different elements; on page 9, in line 10, "1]" should be --11--; in line 18 the sentence is incomplete; and in lines 22 and 23, "Lij and Loj" should be --LIJ and LOJ--; on page 12, in line 10, "LL" should be --11--, and in line 22 the sentence beginning therein is incomplete; and on page 13, in lines 4 and 7, each occurrence of "Lhn" should be Lhn--, and in lines 6 and 7, "Lhd" should be --LHD--. Also, throughout the specification and claim, the inked in inserts or changes have not been initialed and are required to be inserted by amendment.

Appropriate correction is required.

3. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In line 10 reference to "the missile roll axis" has no positive antecedent basis, since a roll axis of the missile has not been previously claimed.

SECRET
DECLASSIFIED BY ORIGINATING AGENCY

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Linscott et al in view of Gauggel. Linscott et al disclose a rolling missile with a target tracker having a restricted field-of-view and signal processing means between the tracker and control members on the missile for directing the missile to a target. Gauggel teaches the use of signal limiting means between the tracker and control members limiting the tracker signal between two valves. To employ the teachings of Gauggel on the missile of Linscott et al is considered obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patent to Dixon et al is cited as of interest to show a missile guidance system.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Charles T. Jordan at telephone number 703-557-2894.

Charles T. Jordan
CHARLES T. JORDAN
EXAMINER
GROUP ART UNIT 221

CTJordan/cjk

DECLASSIFIED BY ORIGINATING AGENCY

04-30-84